



**Meeting Summary**  
***Standards Committee Meeting***  
**6/23/2015**  
**3514A Bush St.**  
**Raleigh, NC**  
**10:00 AM – 12:00 PM**

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Staff Present</u>	<u>Guest</u>
Laura Sykora, Chair	Richard Taylor	
Rodney Cates	Richard Bradford	
Perry Davis	Tina Bone	
Dinah Jeffries	Dave Corn	
Judy Jenkins		
Candy Strezinski		
Jimmy Stewart		
Donna Wright		
Terry Young		
Brandon Zuidema		
Rob Merchant – Phone		
Christy Shearin – Phone		
Jim Soukop - Phone		
<u><b>Members Absent</b></u>	<u><b>Staff Absent</b></u>	
Margie Fry	David Dodd	
Greg Foster		

## **Chairs Opening Remarks**

Laura welcomed everyone. Richard Taylor called roll.

## **Introduction of New Committee Members**

Laura Sykora asked the 2 new members to give us some information about themselves. Perry Davis has 32 years in the fire service. Terry Young has 30 years in fire service.

## **Review of Last Meeting**

Dave Corn gave a review of the last meeting.

## **Rules Review Update**

Laura Sykora asked Richard Bradford to update us on the rules. Richard Bradford stated there are no updates. Richard Taylor asked if there had been any comments from anyone. Richard Bradford stated not officially filed.

Laura Sykora asked folks to get comments from parties interested in the rules and file the comments with Teresa Bank per the notice that is on the boards' website and filed with rules review.

## **Rules Checklist Questionnaire**

Laura Sykora stated the majority of the meeting will be to go through the rules questionnaire. She explained how the committee came up with the questions and how we would make sure folks were complying with the rules.

Dave Corn discussed the peer review process. We have about 6 volunteers at this point. We may need about 25 because we don't want to burn folks out. Laura Sykora stated the peer reviewers would have to get permission from their supervisors. Dave Corn stated we want to be able to send this to PSAPS being reviewed before they are actually reviewed.

Laura Sykora discussed a PSAP needing an action plan if there was a deficiency. Dinah Jeffries asked what were the qualifications of a reviewer. Laura stated that their PSAP would have been reviewed. Dinah asked how were we identifying people's strengths in order to qualify them as a reviewer. Candy stated if we do come up with some training for the reviewers and they do participate then that's a good question. Laura stated we are all open to ideas. Laura stated maybe in the July managers meetings we'll get more folks to volunteer to be a reviewer.

Laura stated we'll start at the beginning on the backup PSAPs. Judy Jenkins asked when were we going to start doing this and Laura responded when the rules are finished.

Laura stated so with a backup PSAP we have a lot in the rules but is it sufficient to ask if there is an approved backup plan. The plan has to be approved by the board staff.

Richard Taylor asked Mr. Bradford for clarification on question number 2. It states in there that secondaries have to comply with the standards so would the backup question be applied to the secondary. Richard Taylor stated the backup plan has to include the secondary or the secondary has to have a plan that fits in with the primary.

Laura asked do we need in the question, do we need to in some way denote primary and funded secondaries have an approved backup plan? Richard Bradford said no.

Laura stated the only thing to add would be approved backup plan by the board staff.

Dave Corn is keeping official changes.

Laura asked if we were good with question one. No answer

Larua asked about question 2. Candy asked who would qualify them. Dinah stated she wasn't real sure what we were asking there. Dave Corn stated would it be too much for the PSAP manager to provide a name and title for the person in the implemental function. Jimmy Stewart stated implemental functions would be easy but not people from vendors. He stated he knew the vendors but not the people.

Can we ask them to provide a name when the rules doesn't ask them to provide one?

Laura stated we would want to develop a form so that there's a name by the equipment being worked on. That way it's consistently provided. We could send the form out to the PSAP ahead of time. It would make the flow a lot better when we arrived.

More discussion on the form.

Dinah Jeffries stated that the NENA website had a form dealing with PSAP survivability.

Laura Sykora asked for staff to look for forms.

Candy Strezinsky stated our form needs to be independent of any one entity.

Jimmy Stewart asked if we really wanted to go into a center and ask for installation records. Laura asked so do we just need the maintenance and test records for a reasonable period of time. Dinah asked what would be my purpose for showing a reviewer an invoice when maintenance was performed. Jimmy Stewart explained you have the stuff you do on a regular basis and then you have other equipment that has a scheduled maintenance. You don't change the oil in the radio. Richard Taylor said the intent is to make sure that a PSAP is maintaining their equipment. This is the whole intent...just to ensure that the PSAP is maintaining the equipment that has been purchased. Dinah asked how do you walk in a center and determine if they're maintaining their phone system. Richard Taylor said that was drilling down too deep. Do you have a maintenance contract on your phone system? That's what the reviewer would be looking for. These are the things that 911 pays for, this is bare basic minimum operating procedures that are paid for out of the 911 fund and so as a good steward, are you ensuring that you're taking care of what you're getting.

Dinah said maintenance agreements and contracts...is that what we're looking for to see if we at least have that in place and also invoices for work that has been performed. Dave Corn stated we're just looking for evidence that the equipment is being maintained.

Laura asked since this would be the first review period would we just want the most recent test or maintenance. Rodney Cates said if we need to set a time limit then why don't we look at 3 years.

Laura asked if that seemed reasonable.

Richard Taylor stated initially we're going to be all over the place. The first time out there's going to have to be a lot of leeway so folks can get organized. This is all brand new for everybody. It's going

to be incumbent of this committee and the board to say they haven't been doing this so we need to show some leeway.

Candy stated she thinks we're going to find this challenging...after the initial visit, we should be able to do three years. Donna Wright said every time she looks at rules she finds things that she could do better.

Dinah said that the first inspection would just be one year, we're trying to learn how to do this. Laura asked if it would be a deficiency if maintenance was done fifteen months ago and not one year. Dinah said this is where we're going to have to give some leeway, we're trying to mold the centers. This is a molding period and this may take up to three years for people to get accustomed to start getting into the rhythm of this is what I have to follow and start doing this checklist. Donna Wright stated this would be a mentoring time. We don't want to scare the PSAP folks so bad that they hate to see us coming. We want them to buy into this. Richard Taylor said a lot of folks think we're going to slap everybody from the get go, but we're not. What good is it for us to shut down a PSAP, is there any value there? What we're looking for is to improve a PSAP. Dinah said we're trying to professionalize it.

Candy likes the way question three is worded because basically it says...show me what you have. Dinah said even in the initial review and the PSAP manager can't find recent maintenance records, this is where recommendations can be given so that the next time around they will probably be ready. Brandon said the better job we do on educating people the better this review will be. We need to educate the PSAP folks before we actually do a review so that the review won't be such a shock. Laura said we do want people to understand what's in the rules.

Someone asked about guarantee of performance. Should that be part of the contract? Dave Corn said guarantee of performance can mean a lot of things. Dinah said this will have to be explained to the entire state as this is what we're looking for.

Dave Corn said we only have one day for reviewers to be on site and we're struggling over one tiny piece of this whole thing. So we need to decide what's important. I don't think people will necessarily read this in much detail so I'm hoping we simplify it or we're going to spend a lot of time explaining it. I'd like to educate people as much as we can.

Rob Merchant stated maybe we could send out a sample survey. I would suggest putting something together kind of what we've been discussing here. The responses we get would give us an idea of where we're going. In other words, send out a survey about maintenance contracts...what would be the response from the various PSAPs? Send the rules out to different regions of the state to see what the responses would be and see where the hang-ups are going to be. Laura said maybe we should start with the reviewers. Brandon said this would help develop some commentary. Dinah said by this checklist I can determine what I have and what I don't have. As reviewers we need to look at the critical pieces in here. Not so much every little piece, but the critical pieces. This is something I could go through in a document and I could provide the information. Brandon said there ought to be documentation for every question.

Laura asked do we need spend more time today on what is the important thing for a reviewer to lay their hands and eyes on and have staff develop a form for everything else.

Dave said when the reviewer gets on site he'll look for the critical issues, but also ask for things that were deficient when the response came back on the form. On top of that, we'll practice this form on the reviewers to sort of be an alpha test.

Laura asked do we continue what we've been doing or do we take a step back and ask what are the critical on site things people need to lay their eyes on at a PSAP and focus in on that part. Do we set this aside until we get the form by staff? Perry thinks we need to set this aside.

Staff is going to work on the form and we're going to review that in the next meeting. Once the committee is good with the form then we'll see what the reviewers think about that.

Laura asked if there were areas in the rules that we need to talk about. Brandon stated he had a couple of questions. The question was raised about somebody being on call for duty at all times. What exactly defines immediately? For smaller PSAPs there's not going to be a supervisor on call. Candy said every agency has a different chain of command and I think this was left the way it is, the non-specific part, it may be a road officer or a senior operator inside the PSAP, but there's always someone that is an accountable source that is in the room, close by, or in a vehicle, but that's different in every organization. Brandon said that would alleviate the concern. Richard Taylor said the whole idea behind this was that there is someone that is capable of relieving that telecommunicator if necessary. What happens if the telecommunicator has a heart attack? What do you do? Is there somebody on duty right now who can go in that 911 center, sit down in that chair, and take 911 calls? We changed this for the police chiefs. The original concept was to have two people on duty and that ran into a lot of flak so that's how this came about changing. Dinah said way back when there was some discussion on the word lead or trained. What constitutes trained as a telecommunicator? There are telecommunicators who are trained, but have not sat in the PSAP. What are we saying there, are we saying it's got to be a seasoned person or a lead qualified person? Dave Corn stated when we first went through this we didn't have supervisor or lead, but this was changed. Laura asked Brandon if that satisfied the concern that he had from the police chiefs. Brandon stated it confused him more. One to fill a seat, and or to have someone to have experience to get in there and handle it.

Laura asked what is a lead qualified. Dinah stated a subject matter expert, a senior person, it all depends on what you define that as. Dave Corn said when we went through this the first time it was experience. Candy said the point was to have a plan. Most PSAPs do. Dinah said this isn't saying to have a plan. She thinks this is asking for somebody in a supervisory role or able to provide supervision and who is also trained as a telcommunicator to be able to respond back to that center. Richard Taylor said under qualifications and training in the rules. This is what has been filed. This is the one that is on the website. Dave Corn said this is different. Brandon said there are two explanations of what that was intended to be. Richard Taylor said he didn't know where the word lead came from. I don't recall us using the word lead. Candy said in the discussion we talked about if you didn't have something to qualify that individual then you're dealing with a trainee so what is the best verbiage to describe that person. Dinah said on the document we're looking at it has certification the other does not.

Richard Bradford said no changes have been made to the rules, those are just informal discussions. I haven't provided anybody any of that so that this kind of confusion wouldn't occur. Richard Bradford said he hadn't provided that information to use in documents. Brandon asked if what was on the screen or on the website was correct...which one. Richard Bradford said like all rules, it will go through changes, but because of the informal discussions there are many changes that will be made.

Most of them are minor things that wouldn't be noticed. There are others that you would notice where things are moved. Brandon asked so this document with the modifications will be filed later or what. Richard Bradford said this document serves no real purpose. The substance of your questions should be addressed against the document that was filed. Brandon asked why are we building a checklist on a different document not the one that was filed. Dave Corn stated obviously things have happened since those rules were written.

Laura stated the substance of what the board approved is still there, but it may be in a different place. Richard Bradford said this is the document that the board approved and this is what was filed. The way this works from a rules process, the document is filed, through little more than just courtesy, this informal discussion goes on so the agency who is promulgating the rules gets some idea of what the rules review commission attorneys think. Ok, so we have that. If we see something that is alarming and a challenge then I would bring that issue back to the board. There was one in this draft...the rule on declaratory rulings needed to be changed. That was it. So when rules review attorneys receive this officially, they respond. They respond with technical objections, which are ninety percent of the changes or they may respond with things that are questionable as far as the law is concerned. Nothing official has been done. When we get the response then I will bring that back to the committee and if the changes need to go to the board then take it to the board. Dave Corn said so what is filed was done in 2013 and what I sent out was done in 2014. Brandon said so what Dave sent is different from what is filed. I'm confused because it seems like the checklist is being built from this document and not what was filed. Dave Corn said so if we proceed further with the unofficial version from 2014, how many will become official. Richard Bradford stated that was unknown. Richard Taylor stated if there is any substantial change that Dave has in the 2014 document that unless it's something that could be changed by rules review those changes would not happen until after these rules are approved and we file to change rules. Richard Bradford said rules and the process is difficult and lengthy. Despite the fact that things may be in a different order the content is pretty much the same so what I would suggest to you trying to be proactive, if you have comments that's a separate issue, fine send those to Teresa Bank. In this forum with the committee and the board if you have issues and concerns like what does lead mean here, fine most of the wording that's in here is substantive and comes from NFPA. There is very little guidance with NFPA documents. If there are concerns that people are seeing now then make those known, there is absolutely nothing that stops the committee or board from recommending a change. If you want to file a comment so that it's in the record with rules review then that's what you should do. This is a forum for trying to ensure that it means what it says and it says what it means.

Much discussion on certification and leads. Richard Taylor said what I think lead means is another person may not be a supervisor but they may be like a senior supervisor or there may be a patrol officer on shift who is not a supervisor but is qualified to be a telecommunicator. Dinah said what is important is if any center would ask me a question or challenge me with this I gotta know what do we mean by certification. These are the standards that reviewers will be looking at. What kind of standard is the certification? I just want to be able to say, this is what it means. Candy said she would think it would be different for the agency. Dinah said certified is different. Are we looking at telecommunicators have been trained which I can show by training records. Laura asked if there is a test that they take. Dinah said sometimes. Richard Taylor said it does mean a certification. The certification can be from DOJ, PowerPhone, or any organization that certifies in the knowledge, skills, and abilities of the job function. It is a credential. It can come from any organization. Rob Merchant said this is where the sample survey would be helpful. Richard Taylor stated this is saying they are certified in those skills and by an agency that can certify. We are so deep into the weeds it's not even funny. Rob Merchant said this should be a process that can change and help improve a PSAP.

Dinah said she respectfully disagreed. I don't think we're going too deep. We need to understand what we're requiring because people are going to ask for this document to be defended.

Brandon asked about the public hearing on the rules that was submitted. Richard Bradford said there are always at least two public hearings. If the rules commission has questions that would require the committee to examine it and may require the board to vote on it again. Brandon asked so the rules that's on the screen are the ones that were filed. Richard Bradford stated yes. Brandon said one specific concern is that calls being answered in a certain amount of time. Is it appropriate to have that rule if the staffing is not provided to support meeting that measure? So this needs to go through the process with Teresa Bank? Richard Taylor said that is a national standard. It doesn't matter how many people you have on staff but what duties are assigned to that telecommunicator. You don't have to have two people in a center to meet that standard. We lightened the standard up so it's not as strict as it was. If a telecommunicator has other duties like serving meals to prisoners in the jail and they can't answer the call, is it acceptable to say it's alright we're feeding the prisoners and they'll call back? It's a matter of who you assign these additional duties. Brandon said so currently Raleigh Wake is meeting the ninety percent rule. The way they're doing it is by having dispatchers take ACD forced 911 calls and someone on the radio can't get an answer on the radio. In that case, it is a problem with numbers. Richard Taylor asked if they were at their optimum staffing level. Brandon stated no. Richard Taylor said so it's not a problem with the rule it's a staffing problem. Brandon said you're not going to correct that quickly. Richard Taylor said so why wouldn't you ask for a waiver. There's not a single rule that doesn't let you ask for a waiver. Dave Corn said 86 out of 119 meets standard in the state. Laura said if this was found to be a deficiency and a waiver hadn't been completed then it would be part of an action plan. Richard Taylor said for everything in here, you have the ability to ask for a waiver.

Laura asked Brandon if there were any other areas that were brought to his attention. Brandon said another one was about the design of a PSAP. I think that question has been somewhat answered. Laura asked if anyone else had any questions. Jimmy Stewart said he didn't but he did see a lot of things we would have to answer...especially about the plans. We should maybe try to develop a sample to have available for directors. Dave Corn stated these plans came from NFPA. Richard Taylor concurred.

Much discussion on the various plans. Richard Taylor stated a good portion of this came from NFPA. Donna Wright stated the NFPA doesn't meet the reality of the real world.

Dave Corn asked if we could create a questionnaire at this time. Richard Taylor said we could on the rules that were filed, not on the potential changes.

Laura said the changes would be carefully tracked so we could modify the form or checklist.

Laura asked when would it be reasonable for us to get back together.

Richard Taylor stated July is not a good month so we need to go into August.

Laura said so for our next meeting we will look at any comments that have been made.

Next meeting is August 18<sup>th</sup> at 10:00am.

Meeting adjourned at 12:27